

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT FUNDS WORKING GROUP

Monday, June 10, 2002 – 1:30 p.m.
MAG Office Building, Suite 200 - Saguaro Room
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

MEMBERS PRESENT

Councilman Greg Stanton, Co-Chair,
Phoenix
Mike Hutchinson, Co-Chair, Mesa,
representing the MAG Management
Committee
Grant Anderson, Goodyear, representing the
MAG Street Committee
Angela Dye, representing the American
Society of Landscape Architects
Arizona Chapter
Marcie Ellis, representing the West Valley
Fine Arts Council

Reed Kempton, Maricopa County,
representing the MAG Pedestrian
Working Group
Andre Licardi, representing the Arizona
Commission of the Arts
Mary O'Connor, Tempe, representing the
MAG Regional Bicycle Task Force
Doug Kupel, representing Archaeological
and Historic Preservation (Arizona
Preservation Foundation)

*Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

OTHERS PRESENT

Ian Cordwell, Cave Creek
Greg Westrum, Chandler
Paula Moloff, Glendale
Dawn M. Coomer, MAG
Dora Vasquez, Maricopa County DOT

Ken Ventura, Mesa
Chris Ewell, Phoenix
P.J. Jasso, Phoenix
John Siefert, Phoenix
Sharon Wood, Phoenix

1. Call to Order

After apologizing for being late, Co-Chair Stanton called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

2. Approval of the May 29, 2002 Meeting Minutes of the Enhancement Funds Working Group

Dawn Coomer noted a correction to the minutes. On page nine in the description of the Glendale 43rd Avenue/Peoria project, Glendale does not currently own the property, but is working to purchase it. Angela Dye also noted a spelling error: Grand Avenue was mistakenly spelled as “Grande” Avenue. Mary O'Connor moved to approve the May 29, 2002 meeting minutes of the Enhancement Funds Working Group. Grant Anderson seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

3. Introduction of Working Group Members and Members of the Audience

Members of the Working Group and the audience were introduced.

4. Call to the Audience

John Siefert addressed the Working Group. He noted several changes to the Camelback Core Pedestrian Enhancement project. The match will be significantly increased. The federal share of the project will be reduced, and the local share will be increased to approximately \$125,000. When asked by Co-Chair Stanton of the change in the match, Mr. Siefert responded that the original local share was about \$29,400.

5. Staff Report

Dawn Coomer addressed the Working Group. She explained that each committee member has ranking sheets and communication from each applicant to explain how changes recommended by the EFWG would be incorporated into the application. Ms. Coomer began with the Surprise Grand Avenue project. Surprise has indicated that the Bell Road project is a higher priority in Surprise. The extension of existing sidewalks on the south side of Bell Road and the west side of Grand Avenue will be added to the design of the project for the consideration of Council. Grant Anderson noted that it was unusual for councils to get involved in design issues.

Ms. Coomer continued by noting that several changes will be made to the Camelback Core Pedestrian Enhancement project application. The applicant has explained how this project links to the pedestrian bridge at 25th Street and Camelback. The project will be designed in accordance with ADA guidelines. Also, as adjacent properties develop in the Core area, developers are requested to add wider sidewalks. This application addresses only intersection enhancements, not outside the intersection area. Also, the median is only 24 feet in width and cannot be narrowed for numerous reasons. As noted by Mr. Siefert earlier, the project match of local funds is being increased from \$30,000 to \$125,000.

Ms. Coomer noted that the Eureka Canal path project applicants were working with SRP to obtain a license agreement for the project. The map will be expanded in the application to show the numerous destinations in the area, such as three schools and nearby shopping. The applicant will also be adding a proposed cross section to the application. The use of volunteers to provide landscaping will be added to the application to show the community involvement aspects of the project. In addition, the project does not involve arterial streets, but crosses three neighborhood streets – alleviating concerns about crossing roadways in the project.

Valley Metro has addressed the concerns of the Working Group as well. They have explained the numerous benefits of the project. The project is only the first installment of what could be an annual event. The applicant will work with school boards and parent groups as suggested by the EFWG. They will also be prepared to give presentations as needed. The budget will be re-allocated to staff time and material development, with a smaller portion for public relations. Also, the generalized comments of concern to committee members will be reworked with more factual based statistical information. This information is provided in their letter.

Ms. Coomer stated that the 13th Street project in Tempe did not have any remaining questions to be addressed. However, Tempe has indicated that they will not be ranking their applications since one is for local funds and the other is for state funds. Glendale has explained that their highest priority project is the Gateway Pocket Park. To reflect committee input, the name of this project will be changed to “Glendale’s Bicycle/Pedestrian Rest Area.” The application has been changed to note that the environmental issues with the project site are being addressed. The project will be ADA accessible, and the budget in the application has been revised to show the local commitment to the project by purchasing the property. Also, the applicant is working with the City of Phoenix to ensure that the path and trail uses on both sides of the Arizona Canal will have access to the Rest Area.

Ms. Dye asked if comments were received on the 71st Avenue Wash project, and Ms. Coomer responded that no significant issues were outstanding on that application. Mr. Anderson asked if there was public support for the project, and Ms. Coomer responded that the issue of public sentiment about the project had not been discussed at the last meeting.

The Chandler Bicycle Lane project has received a district engineer letter of support – a significant accomplishment. The bicycle lanes in this project will be 6 feet in width. The connection of the bicycle lanes to the Consolidated Canal will be at Riggs Road. However, this small connection is on local right-of-way, and is therefore not included with this state application. Chandler does not wish to rank its applications.

The Chandler downtown lighting project will be pedestrian area lighting. The photos in the appendix illustrate the type of lighting used in Phase I, and the type that will be used for Phase II. An additional map was enclosed to show the area for pedestrian lighting. The landscape establishment portion of the budget of the Chandler Air Force F-86 application has also been described. Chandler will place less emphasis on the mitigation issue in the application, and instead focus on the project’s link to pedestrian, bicycle and bus transportation. The applicant will also explain the “give an airman a lift” concept, emphasizing its relationship to surface transportation.

The Town of Gilbert has a use agreement with SRP for its bridges, and the bridges are similar to ones already in place. The bridges will be 15 feet wide and meet AASHTO guidelines. The appearance of the bollards in the photos in the appendix of the application will also be explained.

The MCDOT bridge project will not include sensors on the bridge; sensors and signage will be installed at a safe distance on the bridge approaches. Question 19 has been re-worded to explain that the bridge was not constructed in a sub-standard manner, but did need to be improved to current standards. Also, the cost estimate has much more detail to explain how the bridge bearing replacement will be funded.

The Phoenix Grand Canal project did use the cost estimate information in the project application. Additional trees will be added to the project, which may increase the cost somewhat. The application will also be revised to explain that most of the sidewalk will be removed and replaced, except for a small portion on the north end of the project where existing utility issues prevent removal. The project will also be ADA accessible.

Tempe staff are currently working to obtain a district engineer letter of support for the US 60 Bridge project. Right-of-way issues and project eligibility concerns will be addressed at that time.

Ms. Coomer added that numerous changes will be made to the Guadalupe application. The “equestrian” phrase will be changed to “multi-use” throughout the application. The cost estimate will be revised to reflect which portions of the project will be funded with TE funds, and which will be funded with CMAQ funds. Also, the cost estimate will be revised to reflect the Town’s desire for a 16 foot path. Crosswalks will incorporate ADA concerns, and the plan view will be consistent with the cross-section in the final application.

The Cave Creek application will also be revised as well. Surface types will be investigated, and one that meets ADA will be selected. Public art will be incorporated into the project, and the path will be widened from 10 feet to 12 feet. Signage will be used to facilitate safe crossing of roadways, and additional letters of support will be obtained.

The Peoria application has been substantially changed to reduce the scope of the project. Included in the project is a bridge and 2,300 feet of pathway. The match for the project is approximately 39%. The map shows where the new project will be located.

Ms. Coomer offered to answer questions of the Working Group. Mr. Anderson noted that he was in error about the questionable public support of the 71st Avenue Bridge project. Mary O’Connor asked Phoenix staff about the priority of their projects. Mr. Siefert noted that the Phoenix Camelback Core project was their highest priority.

6. Review, Discussion and Ranking of Round X Enhancement Fund Applications

Co-Chair Stanton noted that applications could now be discussed and ranked. Committee members are asked to anonymously complete ballots provided by MAG staff. Then, MAG staff will compile and calculate initial rankings. A brief break in the meeting is typically called to allow time for the calculations. After the presentation of the results, the EFWG will discuss initial ranking with no additional opportunity for public input.

Doug Kupel asked how to rank projects that incorporate multiple categories. Ms. Coomer responded that typically projects incorporating elements from more than one category are ranked higher in the process. Committee members began to complete their ranking forms. The meeting took a brief recess from 1:50 to 2:30 to allow for completion of the ranking forms and calculation of the rankings. Local and state projects were ranked separately. Initial rankings were written on the white board for audience members and the committee, and are indicated below:

Applicant	Project	Rank
LOCAL PROJECTS		
Phoenix	Camelback Core Pedestrian Enhancement Project	1
Tempe	13 th Street Pedestrian & Bikeway Improvements, Landscape & Artist-Designed Elements	2
Glendale	Gateway Pocket Park Acquisition and Development	3
Maricopa County DOT	Gillespie Dam Bridge Restoration Project	4
Gilbert	Canal Crossing Project	5 (tie)

Applicant	Project	Rank
Guadalupe	Guadalupe Road (1-10 to Tempe Limits)	5 (tie)
Mesa	Eureka Canal Multi-Use Path	7
Peoria	Greenway Channel/ Community Park Multi-Use Path and Pedestrian Bridge	8
Phoenix	Grand Canal to Steele Indian School Park Pathway	9
Glendale	Multi-Use Bridge at 71 st Avenue Wash	10
Chandler	Phase II Pedestrian Lighting Project for Historic Downtown Chandler	11(tie)
Cave Creek	Town Core Handicapped-Accessible Non-Motorized Transportation System	11(tie)
Valley Metro/ RPTA	Bicycle/Pedestrian Safety Program	13
Surprise	Bell Road	14
Chandler	Relocation of An Historical Air Force F-86 Static Display Aircraft	15
Scottsdale	Arizona Transportation Museum/Old Town Scottsdale	16
STATE PROJECTS		
Tempe	County Club Way Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge and Multi-Use Paths	1
Chandler	Bicycle Lanes on SR 87 (Arizona Ave.) South of Ocotillo Rd. to Hunt Hwy.	2
Surprise	Grand Avenue	3

Co-Chair Stanton asked how many local projects might be funded. Ms. Coomer responded that perhaps four or five projects would receive funding, depending on the size of the project. Co-Chair Stanton asked how far down the list the TERC may consider projects, and Ms. Coomer noted that the rankings are considered but not the only factor in the evaluation. Doug Kupel said that the state committee should consider our rankings.

Mary O'Connor suggested that some of the rankings be revised. She suggested that the Mesa project be increased since it was a neighborhood based project. Ms. O'Connor suggested switching the ranking of the Gilbert project and the Mesa project.

Angela Dye asked why the Valley Metro proposal ranked so low. She added that the concept seemed to be very good and needed, but that the application simply needed some work. She asked for some explanation from the EFWG. Andre Licardi stated that the project application was very uncertain. For example, how will schools be reached? Which schools will be involved? Co-Chair Stanton added that planning is important in developing project applications.

Marcie Ellis suggested that the Guadalupe project should be moved higher since it was a needed project. Also, the project does incorporate public art. She suggested that the Guadalupe project be ranked as “5,” Mesa be ranked as “6” and Gilbert be ranked as “7.” Ms. Dye added that the Guadalupe project has not been well thought out and defined, even though the project appeared to be needed. Doug Kupel added that all three projects are excellent, but that the Gilbert application was the most well-written and thought-out of the three applications. Shouldn’t the applicant be given some credit for developing a good application?

Grant Anderson said he agreed with Ms. Dye, and that the Guadalupe project had not been well thought out. How will the TE project integrate with the CMAQ funded project already in the MAG program? Mr. Anderson suggested that the projects be ranked as follows: Mesa, Gilbert, Guadalupe. He stated that delaying the Guadalupe project a year did not seem to pose a problem, whereas Mesa and Gilbert both have significant investments in canal systems that should be considered.

Andre Licardi noted that based on his experience at the state committee, looking at need and community impact is very important. The state will consider this factor in their evaluation. There is more need and community impact in Guadalupe than in the other areas.

Ms. Dye added that Gilbert has received funding for TE projects in prior years.

Mr. Anderson moved to rank the local projects as follows, with Ms. Dye seconding the motion:

Applicant	Project	Rank
Phoenix	Camelback Core Pedestrian Enhancement Project	1
Tempe	13 th Street Pedestrian & Bikeway Improvements, Landscape & Artist-Designed Elements	2
Glendale	Gateway Pocket Park Acquisition and Development	3
Maricopa County DOT	Gillespie Dam Bridge Restoration Project	4
Guadalupe	Guadalupe Road (1-10 to Tempe Limits)	5
Mesa	Eureka Canal Multi-Use Path	6
Gilbert	Canal Crossing Project	7
Peoria	Greenway Channel/ Community Park Multi-Use Path and Pedestrian Bridge	8
Phoenix	Grand Canal to Steele Indian School Park Pathway	9
Glendale	Multi-Use Bridge at 71 st Avenue Wash	10
Chandler	Phase II Pedestrian Lighting Project for Historic Downtown Chandler	11(tie)
Cave Creek	Town Core Handicapped-Accessible Non-Motorized Transportation System	11(tie)
Valley Metro/ RPTA	Bicycle/Pedestrian Safety Program	13

Applicant	Project	Rank
Surprise	Bell Road	14
Chandler	Relocation of An Historical Air Force F-86 Static Display Aircraft	15
Scottsdale	Arizona Transportation Museum/Old Town Scottsdale	16

Co-Chair Stanton asked if the tie in position 11 was an issue, and Ms. Coomer stated that projects could be tied. Projects have been submitted to the state in that manner.

Mr. Licardi asked about the logic of submitting the state all projects. Perhaps the number of projects should be limited. Co-Chair Stanton stated that this logic could work against us as well. What if we give only the top seven projects, and then only three are funded? This would also be a problem. Mr. Anderson added that the availability of funds is also a consideration. Perhaps a small project could be funded and somehow fit if there are only a small amount of funds remaining.

Ms. Dye noted that there are some issues with the two projects on the bottom of the list. It's very important to consider the intention of the federal legislation. She added that we have not received a response from Scottsdale, and it doesn't appear that the project has a government sponsor. Also, project #15 may not be eligible.

Ms. O'Connor suggested that #16 only be submitted with a government sponsor, and that the applicant be given some time to obtain the sponsorship information before the application is submitted to ADOT. Ms. Coomer noted that the application could be submitted to ADOT, but that it would be eliminated without a local sponsor. Also, the F-86 project may not be eligible.

Ms. O'Connor stated she was uncomfortable with determining whether the Chandler F-86 project was eligible without seeing the revised application. Besides, this project does have a local sponsor.

Mr. Anderson moved to not submit the Scottsdale project to the state for additional evaluation, and Co-Chair Hutchinson seconded the motion. The motion passed, with Doug Kupel voting against the motion.

Ms. Ellis moved to not submit the Chandler F-86 project to the state for additional evaluation, and Ms. Dye seconded the motion. Mr. Kupel explained that the two projects at the bottom of the ranking are both historic preservation projects. The other projects are all very similar – bridges and multi-use paths. It is important to submit a diversity of projects to the state level. Ms. Ellis stated that the historic preservation projects are good, but are not well suited for transportation enhancement funding. Other sources of funding, such as Heritage funds, might be more appropriate for these projects.

Ms. O'Connor added that the Chandler project does have a local sponsor, and so it should be forwarded to the state. Chandler has tried to address concerns in its application. Also, it's difficult to know if the project is eligible without seeing a revised application. In contrast, the Scottsdale project has no local sponsor, although it appears to be eligible. Mr. Kempton added that two other Chandler projects have been ranked higher by the EFWG, so the lowest ranked project may not even be considered by the state.

Co-Chair Stanton called for the question. The motion passed, with Doug Kupel and Mary O'Connor voting against the motion. Grant Anderson moved to forward the following list of ranked applications to the state, with Mary O'Connor seconding the motion:

Applicant	Project	Rank
LOCAL PROJECTS		
Phoenix	Camelback Core Pedestrian Enhancement Project	1
Tempe	13 th Street Pedestrian & Bikeway Improvements, Landscape & Artist-Designed Elements	2
Glendale	Gateway Pocket Park Acquisition and Development	3
Maricopa County DOT	Gillespie Dam Bridge Restoration Project	4
Guadalupe	Guadalupe Road (1-10 to Tempe Limits)	5
Mesa	Eureka Canal Multi-Use Path	6
Gilbert	Canal Crossing Project	7
Peoria	Greenway Channel/ Community Park Multi-Use Path and Pedestrian Bridge	8
Phoenix	Grand Canal to Steele Indian School Park Pathway	9
Glendale	Multi-Use Bridge at 71 st Avenue Wash	10
Chandler	Phase II Pedestrian Lighting Project for Historic Downtown Chandler	11(tie)
Cave Creek	Town Core Handicapped-Accessible Non-Motorized Transportation System	11(tie)
Valley Metro/ RPTA	Bicycle/Pedestrian Safety Program	13
Surprise	Bell Road	14
STATE PROJECTS		
Tempe	County Club Way Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge and Multi-Use Paths	1
Chandler	Bicycle Lanes on SR 87 (Arizona Ave.) South of Ocotillo Rd. to Hunt Hwy.	2
Surprise	Grand Avenue	3

The motion passed unanimously.

7. Other Items Relevant to the Round X and Future Enhancement Fund Applications

The Working Group discussed other items relevant to this funding cycle and future enhancement fund cycles. Marcie Ellis noted that ADOT does not have a commitment to art in enhancement projects. A meeting should be scheduled with them to determine how art can be incorporated into projects. People are very interested in art, especially along freeways.

Andre Licardi stated that perhaps definitions and expectations need more clarification. The TE application states that “stand alone public art is not scenic beautification.” Cities generally want the art incorporated into projects, but ADOT staff has a different interpretation. Many cities use local arts commissions to do the actual artwork, and federal funds to prepare the site for artwork. This may be a possible approach. He added that we need to make a greater effort in this state to join with public organizations who fund art. Some states already have these processes in place, but Arizona does not.

Angela Dye added that ADOT has issues with stand alone public art that doesn't integrate with the transportation elements of the project. ADOT staff should discuss with the EFWG about this issue, and clarify their position. Ms. Ellis added that functional art is very important, and can be included in all projects. Hiring in the project development process can help identify appropriate opportunities for functional art in projects. We should rank those projects who incorporate art and artists into the design process higher than those projects which don't.

Co-Chair Stanton summarized the key issues. How can the EFWG work with ADOT to change their position? And, how can the EFWG ranking change to better incorporate art? Also, does this committee need to meet with ADOT? If so, when should this occur?

Ms. Dye stated that the EFWG should meet with ADOT. Mr. Licardi noted that the EFWG needs to understand their position, and be sure that it is a policy directive rather than a staff interpretation. He added that Tucson has been very successful in integrating public art into projects, and that we need to speak with Tucson to understand how they have been able to do this. The issue is whether public art is allowable.

Mary O'Connor recommended that we discuss this issue with the Pima Association of Governments, and see how they address the issue. Perhaps the sentiment is shared, and MAG and PAG could work together to address the issue. This committee has always supported public art and has had members with appropriate backgrounds. ADOT has traditionally supported public art, but this has changed. Perhaps this is a staff issue rather than a policy position of ADOT. Ms. O'Connor added that we should wait to meet with ADOT until after the TERC meeting in October.

Doug Kupel added that it might be more appropriate for MAG staff to contact the Tucson area, and see how the issue can be addressed. Perhaps some research on art projects that have been successful would be helpful. Mr. Licardi added that support at the state level is also important, and that cities should work with their local arts commissions. Co-Chair Stanton suggested that a sub-committee meet to discuss the issue, and that the issue be brought back to the entire EFWG after the TERC meeting in October. Ms. Ellis, Ms. Dye, Ms. O'Connor and Mr. Licardi volunteered to serve on the sub-committee.

Mr. Kempton said that projects submitted should have art elements. However, MCDOT would need some assistance in knowing how to incorporate art into public works projects. Additional follow through may be needed to help educate cities and towns on how to integrate public art into projects. Co-Chair Stanton suggested that the EFWG wait for the sub-committee reports before any action. Mr. Licardi added that the Arizona Commission on the Arts has staff who can help incorporate art into public works projects.

Ms. Dye briefly discussed the white paper being compiled by the American Society of Landscape Architects on the TEA-3 reauthorization. Two issues identified thus far include public art, environmental streamlining, and having sufficient staffing at the state level to actually construct enhancement projects. Co-Chair Stanton noted that Phoenix considers the reauthorization a major project, and suggested that interacting with other cities may be helpful. GPEC also has a position on the reauthorization. Ms. Dye stated that the Society is working with other lobbying groups.

8. Future Meeting Dates

Co-Chair Stanton noted that the subcommittee would need to meet to address issues of public art in enhancement projects. Also, the issue of the white paper of the American Society of Landscape Architects could be discussed. A future meeting will be scheduled for February or March of next year.

The meeting adjourned at 3:23 p.m.